[11th September 1946

" (e) Rules have been issued for both Assistant Public Prosecutors and Assistant Crown Prosecutors. A copy [a] of the rules is placed on the table of the House.

" (f) The answer is in the negative."

Sri R. SURYANARAYANA RAO :—" May I know, Sir, why these Assistant Crown Prosecutors in the City alone should be appointed by the Commissioner of Police, while in the mufassal, the District Magistrates are empowered to appoint them?"

The Hon. Sri K. BHASHYAM :—" The Commissioner of Police in the City occupies a position which is equivalent to a District Magistrate."

Sri R. SURYANARAYANA RAO :—" Since the object is that these Public Prosecutors are appointed on behalf of the Crown, the Police should not have anything to do with their appointments?"

The Hon. Sri K. BHASHYAM :—" I may say that at present this question is under my consideration."

Sri R. SURYANARAYANA RAO :—" Is it not a fact that these Assistant Public Prosecutors are required to submit their diaries through the District Superintendents of Police?"

The Hon. Sri K. BHASHYAM :—" I should like to have notice of the question."

Creation of an independent Deputy Tahsildar's division in East Godavari district.

* 58 *Q.*—Sri T. PURUSHOTHAM : Will the Hon. the Minister for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that the Government have contemplated or are contemplating the creation of an independent Deputy Tahsildar's division with Sub-treasury facilities in the place of the present Deputy Tahsil division of Kothapeta in East Godavari district; and

(b) if the answer is in the negative, whether the Government propose to consider the matter in view of the geographical difficulties due to the " Vianateyam river " cutting across the present Razole taluk?

The Hon. Sri K. R. KARANTH :—" (a) & (b) The Government considered in 1930 and again in 1937 the proposal to convert the Kothapeta sub-taluk in the Razole taluk, East Godavari district, into an independent Deputy Tahsildar's charge with a sub-treasury at Kothapeta but it was deferred in view of the extra expenditure.

" On the representation of the hon. Member in his letter, dated 3rd August 1946, the Government have again taken up the matter and have called for a report from the Board of Revenue. The Board's report is awaited."

---

[a] Printed as Appendix I on pages 407–410 infra.